



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,998	09/30/2003	Logan M. Colby	POU920030142US1	5251
<div>7590 07/31/2007 Philmore H. Colburn II CANTOR COLBURN LLP 55 Griffin Road South Bloomfield, CT 06002</div>			<div>EXAMINER LAZARO, DAVID R</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT 2155</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE 07/31/2007</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE PAPER</div>

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/674,998

Applicant(s)

COLBY ET AL.

Examiner

David Lazaro

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed 05/15/07.
2. Claims 1-3 and 9-16 were amended.
3. Claims 1-16 are pending in this office action.

### ***Response to Amendment***

4. The examiner withdraws the rejection of claims 3, 11, 12, 15 and 16 under 35. U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, based on applicant's amendment.
5. Applicant's arguments filed 05/15/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See Response to Arguments. Note that while the same art is cited in this office action, the grounds of rejection for some claims have changed based on applicant's amendment.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 12 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The following subject matter is not found in the prior art nor is it obvious in view of the prior art:

“a web based programming language method including a run-as-task descriptor operable for determining a current task name value associated with a request to access an application;

Art Unit: 2155

wherein said run-as-task descriptor values include:

caller, operable for specifying a current task name as 'run with caller's task name;

own, operable for specifying a current task name as 'run with an application name of an application containing a current component'; and

specified, operable for specifying an explicit task name to run as a current task name." (as from claim 12 and 16)

### ***Claim Objections***

8. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 2 includes the language "selects at one of said plurality of policies". This language is grammatically unclear. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 1, 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0059946 by Price (Price).

Art Unit: 2155

11. With respect to Claim 1, Price teaches a system for providing context-based dynamic policy assignment in a distributed processing environment, comprising:

a first resource management host in communication with a client system via a distributed network architecture (Pages 1-2 [0018]-[0019] server system connect to client through network);

at least one application executable by said first resource management host (Page 19 [0019] - hosted architecture with applications executed by server);

a dynamic policy assignment system executing on said first resource management host (Page 2 [0020] and Page 3 [0027]-[0028]: servlet and associated components provide policy assignment)

a plurality of policies stored on said first resource management host (Page 2 [0021] and Page 3 [0027]-[0028]: security data source stores policy information such as group memberships and security flags), wherein at least one of the plurality of task names associated with said client system (Page 3 [0028] set of flags are specific to a user object instantiated in response to a client-side session request), and a plurality of task names associated with a request to access an application are mapped to the plurality of policies (Page 3 [0028] and [0033] -set of business rules are associated with application, the business rules are mapped to sets of security flags); and

an application profile associated with said client system, said application profile received by said first resource management host in response to a request by said client system to receive application hosting services, said application hosting services including executing said at least one application on behalf of said client system (Page 2

Art Unit: 2155

[0019], [0022]-[0023] request includes application profile including profile ID and task name);

wherein said dynamic policy assignment system performs:

receiving said request at said first resource management host (Page 2 [0022]-[0023]);

based upon a profile ID and task name associated with said application profile, selecting at least one of said plurality of policies for an application instance related to said request (Page 2 [0025]-[0028]: security policies are selected and established based on the context of the application and user information associated with the client request);

associating said at least one of said plurality of policies to said application instance (Page 2 [0025]-[0029]: security policies are selected and established based on the context of the application and user information associated with the client request); and

executing said application on behalf of said client system (Page 3 [0028] and Page 4 [0036]-[0037] and [0040]: execution of the requested application occurs based on the policies associated with it)

changing dynamically at least one of said plurality of policies for an application instanced based on a task name change (Page 2 [0025] and Page 3 [0028]- policy is based on context of application and business rule, if the business rule changes, the policy changes as well).

12. With respect to claims 9 and 13, Price teaches a method (and corresponding storage medium) for providing context-based dynamic policy assignment in a distributed processing environment, comprising:

receiving a request at a first host system to execute a first application on behalf of a client system, said request including an application profile (Page 2 [0019], [0022]-[0023] request includes application profile including profile ID and task name);

based upon a profile ID and one or more task names associated with said application profile (Page 2 [0019], [0022]-[0023] request includes application profile including profile ID and business rules), selecting at least one policy for an application instance related to said request (Page 2 [0025]-[0028]: security policies are selected and established based on the context of the application and user information associated with the client request) and mapping said one or more task names to a plurality of policies (Page 3 [0028] and [0033] -set of business rules are associated with application, the business rules are mapped to sets of security flags), wherein at least one of the plurality of policies is associated with said client system (Page 3 [0028] set of flags are specific to a user object instantiated in response to a client-side session request);

associating said at least one policy to said application instance (Page 2 [0025]-[0029]: security policies are selected and established based on the context of the application and user information associated with the client request);

executing said first application on behalf of said client system (Page 3 [0028] and Page 4 [0036]-[0037] and [0040]: execution of the requested application occurs based on the policies associated with it); and

changing dynamically said at least one policy associated with said application instance based upon a task name change (Page 2 [0025] and Page 3 [0028]- policy is based on context of application and business rule, if the business rule changes, the policy changes as well).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 2-8, 10, 11, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price in view of U.S. Patent 7,076,562 by Singhal et al. (Singhal).

15. With respect to Claim 2, Price further teaches said dynamic policy assignment system selects one of the plurality of policies of a given application based on the task name associated with the application (Page 2 [0025] and Page 3 [0028] and [0033]).

Price does not explicitly disclose further comprising a second resource management host in communication with said client system and said first resource management host via said distributed network architecture, said second resource management host receiving said request forwarded by said first resource management



host; wherein said request includes a request to execute a second application different from said at least one application, said second application stored on said second resource management host.

Singhal teaches a system with application level enforcement of policies based on user requests and an associated context (Col. 3 lines 58-67 and Col. 4 lines 47-54 and Col. 7 lines 56-67). The system includes a first resource management host, which can forward a users request to a second resource management host, allowing the second host to execute an application stored on the second host (Col. 5 lines 1-14 and Col. 6 lines 58-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by Price and modify it as indicated by Singhal such that it further comprises a second resource management host in communication with said client system and said first resource management host via said distributed network architecture, said second resource management host receiving said request forwarded by said first resource management host; wherein said request includes a request to execute a second application different from said at least one application, said second application stored on said second resource management host and wherein said dynamic policy assignment system selects at one of said plurality of policies of second application based on a task name associated with said second application. One would be motivated to have this, as it is desirable to implement policies associated with applications including those on other host systems (In Singhal: Col. 2 lines 61-66).

16. With respect to claim 3, Price further teaches wherein said first resource management host and said second resource management host are operating in a web based programming environment and provide web based programming services to said client system via said dynamic policy assignment system (In Price: Page 2 [0020] - java operational environment for providing services).

17. With respect to claim 4, Price further teaches wherein said policies include at least one of: security; transaction; persistence; and performance (In Price: Page 2 [0021] and Page 3 [0027]).

18. With respect to claim 5, Price further teaches wherein said plurality of policies includes an access intent policy (In Price: Page 2 [0021] and Page 3 [0027]).

19. With respect to claim 6, Price further teaches wherein said application profile includes a profile ID operable for identifying said client system and distinguishing said client system from other client systems (In Price: Page 2-3 [0025]-[0026]: user identification such as userid).

20. With respect to claim 7, Price further teaches wherein said application profile includes a task name operable for identifying an application requested by said client system (In Price: Page 2 [0025]-[0026]: application name with business rule).

21. With respect to claim 8, Price further teaches wherein said task name is a default value reflecting a name of said application requested by said client (In Price: Page 2 [0025]-[0026]: application name with business rule).

22. With respect to claims 10 and 14, Price further teaches said dynamic policy assignment system selects one of the plurality of policies of a given application based

on the task name associated with the application (Page 2 [0025] and Page 3 [0028] and [0033]).

Price does not explicitly disclose forwarding said request to a second host system along with said application profile wherein said request contains a request to access a second application stored on said second host system.

Singhal teaches a system with application level enforcement of policies based on user requests and an associated context (Col. 3 lines 58-67 and Col. 4 lines 47-54 and Col. 7 lines 56-67). The system includes a first resource management host, which can forward a users request to a second resource management host; allowing the second host to execute an application stored on the second host (Col. 5 lines 1-14 and Col. 6 lines 58-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method (and corresponding storage medium) disclosed by Price and modify it as indicated by Singhal such that it further comprises forwarding said request to a second host system along with said application profile wherein said request contains a request to access a second application stored on said second host system and wherein said dynamic policy assignment system selects at least one policy with said second application instance based on a task name associated with said second application. One would be motivated to have this as it is desirable to implement policies associated with applications including those on other host systems (In Singhal: Col. 2 lines 61-66).

23. With respect to claim 11, Price further teaches wherein said first host system and said second host system are operating in a web based programming language environment and provide web based programming language services to said client system via said dynamic policy assignment system (In Price: Page 2 [0020] - java operational environment for providing services).

24. With respect to claim 15, Price further teaches wherein said first host system and said second host system are operating in a web based programming language environment and provide web based programming language services to said client system via said dynamic policy assignment system (In Price: Page 2 [0020] - java operational environment for providing services).

### ***Response to Arguments***

25. Applicant's arguments filed 05/15/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

26. Applicant argues on page 9 of the remarks - "Price fails to disclose or suggest a plurality of policies stored on said first resource management host, wherein at least one of the plurality of policies is associated with said client system, and a plurality of task names associated with a request to access an application are mapped to the plurality of policies, as recited in claim 1."

- a. Examiner's response - Price teaches a plurality of policies in the form of sets of flags (Page 3, [0028]). The set of flags are specific to a user object

instantiated in response to a client-side session request (i.e. - associated with said client system). Further more, the determination of what set of flags to apply depends on the specific request to access an application (Page 3 [0028]). The request corresponds to a particular context of a service, application and business rule (Page 2 [0025]). The examiner interprets the business rules to correspond to the plurality of task names based on the disclosure on page 3, [0033].

Particularly, a set of business rules is associated with an application. As such, a particular request with a context for a given service and application will have a plurality of task names associated with it (business rules). Each context of the given service, application and one of the plurality of business rules will have mapped to it a set of security flags (a policy). As such, the teachings of Price are within the scope of the claim language.

### ***Conclusion***

27. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

28. U.S. Patent 6,466,984 by Naveh et al. - Discloses the mapping of policies to traffic flows generated by an application instance.

29. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 571-272-3986. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2155

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



David Lazaro  
July 17, 2007



SALEH NAJJAR  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER